



**Award Recommendation Letter**

Date: January 28, 2021

To: Roxie Coble, Director of Strategic Sourcing  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Stephanie Nelson, Senior Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 21-2633  
Laboratory Supplies and Related Services

**Estimated Two (2) Year Contract Amount: \$2,133,670**

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (“RFP”) 21-2633, it is the evaluation team’s recommendation that **Neta Scientific, Inc., Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc., and VWR International, LLC** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide laboratory supplies and related services for the State of Indiana.

The State of Indiana recommends for selection **Neta Scientific** to begin contract negotiations to provide Chromatography supplies, Lab Chemicals, Labware, Lab Filtration supplies, and Microscopes & Accessories.

The State of Indiana recommends for selection **Thermo Fisher Scientific** to begin contract negotiations to provide Lab Consumables, Biologicals, Microbiology & Molecular Biology supplies, Lab Equipment, Furniture & Storage supplies, Lab Chemicals, Labware supplies, Lab Filtration supplies, Safety Equipment and Clothing, Testing Equipment & Particle Sizing supplies, Sample Collection and Shipping supplies.

The State of Indiana recommends for selection **VWR International** to begin contract negotiations to provide Lab Consumables, Biologicals, Microbiology & Molecular Biology supplies, Lab Equipment, Furniture & Storage supplies, Chromatography supplies, Lab Chemicals, Lab Diagnostics supplies, Lab Instruments & Utensils, Labware supplies, Lab Filtration supplies, Safety Equipment & Clothing, Testing Equipment & Particle Sizing supplies, Sample Collection & Shipping supplies, and Microscopes & Accessories.

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from three (3) vendors:

- Neta Scientific, Inc.
- Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.
- VWR International, LLC

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, Proposal Evaluation, of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration (“IDOA”) and scored by the evaluation team:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (40 points)
- Price (40 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (5 points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, “Evaluation Criteria, of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

The proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All three Respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality (“MAQ”)**

**Business Proposal**

For the business proposal evaluation, IDOA and the evaluation team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the business proposal: Respondent information and financial stability, references, proposed subcontractors and team structure, and all other remaining sections of the Business Proposal.

**Technical Proposal**

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the technical proposal: catalog and online capabilities, data management and integrity, implementation and transition, customer service and account management, reporting, shipping and delivery, and supplier relationships.

The evaluation team’s scores were based on a review of the respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal and subsequent clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Initial MAQ Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (50 Max)</b>
Neta Scientific, Inc.	24.69
Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.	38.25
VWR International, LLC	32.50

**C. Cost Proposal**

Cost scores were normalized, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated within each product category. The lowest cost proposal for each product category, relative to their total cost, received a total of 40 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent’s total cost:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 40 \text{ points}$$

This process was repeated for twelve of the thirteen product categories\*. A Respondent's cost scores were summed and then divided by the number of product categories upon which they bid to arrive at an average cost score. This average cost score became each Respondent's total cost score. The cost scoring is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score (40 Max)
Neta Scientific, Inc.	38.78
Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.	27.31
VWR International, LLC	31.02

*\*Microscopes and Accessories had no historical spend and no Market Basket, and was not included in the Cost Evaluation.*

**D. Initial Round Total Scores**

The Cost Score was then combined with the Management Assessment and Quality Score to generate the total score for this step of the evaluation process as described in the RFP. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 80 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Initial MAQ + Cost Score**

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (40 Max)	Total Score <sup>1</sup> (80 max)
Neta Scientific, Inc.	24.69	38.78	63.46
Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.	38.25	27.31	65.56
VWR International, LLC	32.50	31.02	63.52

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, the State had the option to “short-list.” To ensure the State’s needs for laboratory supplies and related services were met, the State did not shortlist respondents and moved all Respondents on to the next round.

**E. Oral Presentation**

All Respondents were invited to deliver an oral presentation to the State’s evaluation team. MAQ scores were updated based on the oral presentation and subsequent clarifications. Respondents were also given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round. Only VWR International, LLC elected to submit a BAFO.

The scores for the short-listed respondents after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: Oral Presentation MAQ + BAFO Cost Score**

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (30 Max)	Total Score <sup>1</sup> (80 max)
Neta Scientific, Inc.	26.69	38.78	65.46
Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.	39.00	25.56	64.56
VWR International, LLC	34.94	32.47	67.40

<sup>1</sup>Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.

## F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the respondents in Buy Indiana (5 points) using criteria published in the RFP. No Respondents qualified for Buy Indiana.

**Table 5: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (40 Max)</b>	<b>Cost Score (40 Max)</b>	<b>Buy Indiana (5 max)</b>	<b>Total Score<sup>2</sup> (85 max)</b>
Neta Scientific, Inc.	26.69	38.78	00.00	<b>65.46</b>
Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc.	39.00	25.56	00.00	<b>64.56</b>
VWR International, LLC	34.94	32.47	00.00	<b>67.40</b>

### Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP. To ensure the State's needs were met across all product categories, the State determined that an award to all three Respondents was appropriate. Respondents have been recommended to begin contract negotiations for the categories that they submitted a proposal for.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

*Stephanie Nelson*

Stephanie Nelson  
Sr. Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration

---

<sup>2</sup>Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.